UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,917	07/15/2003	Christopher J. Allen	60021-378501	7149

29838   7590   11/03/2006

OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY, LLP
PLAZA VII, SUITE 3300
45 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-1609

EXAMINER
STACE, BRENT S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/619,917	ALLEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brent S. Stace	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 August 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 July 2003* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1.   This communication is responsive to the amendment filed August 15th, 2006.

Claims 1-33 are pending. In the amendment filed August 15th, 2006, Claims 1, 8, 12,

19, 22, 23, and 30 are amended and Claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 are independent

Claims. The examiner acknowledges that no new matter was introduced and the claims

are supported by the specification. This action is FINAL.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed August 15th, 2006 with respect to Claims 1-33 have

been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3.   The scope of the independent claims has changed since the independent claims

have different limitations and further clarification.

4.   With respect to the applicant's argument with respect to exemplary Claim 1

(including Claims 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30) that the references allegedly do not teach

"wherein the central skills database has limited access to a routing system of the call

center to optimize contacts," the examiner respectfully disagrees. McFarlane appears

to teach this in the cited sections below of McFarlane, col. 4, lines 53-59. Here

McFarlane teaches that the skills database is used, among other factors to connect the

calling party to a proper agent. McFarlane has limited access in the fact that the skills

database is only used as one way/factor of effectively routing a call to an agent (since

multiple agents can have the same skills/skill levels (see Fig. 6)).

5.   With respect to the applicant's argument with respect to exemplary Claim 1

(including Claims 12 and 23) that the references allegedly do not teach "selectively

synchronizing routing logic of the routing system...such that the routing logic determines

which of the plurality of agents are to handle a contact based on at least skill data,

wherein the synchronizing is independent of the updating," the examiner respectfully

disagrees. Bremers and McFarlane appear to teach these limitations in the cited

sections below of Bremers, col. 6, lines 32-42 with Bremers, col. 8, lines 27-39 with

Bremers, col. 9, lines 35-42 with Bremers, cols. 15-16, lines 63-8 with McFarlane, col. 4,

lines 40-59.

As for the "such that the routing logic determines which of the plurality of agents

are to handle a contact based on at least skill data" limitation, McFarlane, col. 4, lines

40-59 clearly teaches where McFarlane says "The identified service request is mapped

to a selected agent in the pool of agents as a function of agent skill level, agent

availability..." Amendments to Claims 8, 19, and 30 are along the same lines as the

amendments for Claims 1, 12, and 23. Therefore, these arguments apply to Claims 8,

19, and 30.

As for the "selectively synchronizing routing logic of the routing system...,

wherein the synchronizing is independent of the updating" limitation, Bremers teaches

this in the cited sections below of Bremers, col. 6, lines 32-42 with Bremers, col. 8, lines

27-39 with Bremers, col. 9, lines 35-42 with Bremers, cols. 15-16, lines 63-8. Here

Bremers teaches selectively synchronizing by synchronizing only the changes made.

Bremers also teaches wherein the synchronizing is independent of the updating by

stating that the synchronization can occur on "synchronization events (e.g. triggered by

a synchronization schedule, a user command...)". Clearly, synchronization based on a

synchronization schedule or a user command is independent of updating the skill data.

Additionally, McFarlane teaches the routing logic (rules and source data in the present

specification) in McFarlane, col. 5, lines 49-51 with McFarlane, col. 10, lines 29-47

(which is a summary/example of McFarlane, col, 7, lines 19-67) with McFarlane's own

routing rules and data used in the rules. Amendments to Claims 8, 19, and 30 are

along the same lines as the amendments for Claims 1, 12, and 23. Therefore, these

arguments apply to Claims 8, 19, and 30.

6.   With respect to the applicant's argument with respect to exemplary Claim 1

(including Claims 12 and 23) that the references allegedly disclosing more than the

claimed subject matter because the references allegedly "create two separate points for

accessing the same or similar passive data," the examiner respectfully agrees.

However, the claims do not limit the reference being applied because the reference

teaches more than the claims do. Furthermore, if the claims were limiting, merely the

synchronization techniques of Bremers are being used in the combination, not the

structure of Bremers. Additionally, as the claim is written, it appears that there are two

access points for accessing the data. "Synchronizing routing logic...with skill-based

information...in the central skill database" implies that the routing logic contains skill

information from the central skill database. So, it appears that the routing logic and the central skill database both contain skill-based information.

7.   With respect to the applicant's argument with respect to exemplary Claim 1 (including Claims 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30) that the "synchronized data in the prior art is sitting passively in another storage device waiting to be accessed, and is not used to actively change functions within the routing system," the examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown above, the data is actively used to change the function of selecting an effective agent in the routing system.

8.   With respect to the applicant's argument with respect to exemplary Claim 1 (including Claims 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30) that "one skilled in the art would not look to the combination of McFarlane and Bremers to solve the problem facing the Applicants," the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references is found in the references themselves. Specifically, Bremers and McFarlane both are directed towards utilizing databases on computers, and combining the two together would cost.

9.   The remainder of the arguments relate to "optimizing a call center that has limited access." These arguments are met in the responses above.

10.   The examiner would like to note that the applicant's have cited paragraph [0011]

of the specification to, essentially, show that the specification has support for the

limitation of "limited access to a routing system of a call center to optimize contacts." As

the segment of the specification is worded, it appears that it is well-known in the art that

CTI or ACD (switching centers/call centers) restrict access to internal data (apparently

rating information) since the specification states "...because CTI and ACD systems

<u>necessarily</u> use and restrict access to internal data..." (emphasis added). Additionally,

"limited access" can have many definitions relating to 1) access rights/restricted access

2) periodic access (such as a synchronization schedule of Bremers) and 3) only partially

accessed. It should be clear from the above arguments which broadest reasonable

interpretation the examiner has applied. However, the claim should be amended to

further clarify the scope of "limited access." A broadest reasonable interpretation was

used since "restricts access" from the specification is not necessarily "limited access."

11.   The other claims argued merely because of a dependency on a previously

argued claim(s) or because they are substantially the same as a previously argued

claim(s) in the arguments presented to the examiner, filed August 15th, 2006, are moot

in view of the examiner's interpretation of the claims and art and are still considered

rejected based on their respective rejections from a prior Office action (parts of recited

again below).

Response to Amendment

Information Disclosure Statement

12.   The listing of references in the Search Report is not considered to be an

information disclosure statement (IDS) complying with 37 CFR 1.98. 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2)

requires a legible copy of: (1) each foreign patent; (2) each publication or that portion

which caused it to be listed; (3) for each cited pending U.S. application, the application

specification including claims, and any drawing of the application, or that portion of the

application which caused it to be listed including any claims directed to that portion,

unless the cited pending U.S. application is stored in the Image File Wrapper (IFW)

system; and (4) all other information, or that portion which caused it to be listed. In

addition, each IDS must include a list of all patents, publications, applications, or other

information submitted for consideration by the Office (see 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1) and (b)),

and MPEP § 609.04(a), subsection I. states, "the list ... must be submitted on a

separate paper." Therefore, the references cited in the Search Report have not been

considered. Applicant is advised that the date of submission of any item of information

or any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining

compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the IDS, including all

"statement" requirements of 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Specification

13.   In light of the applicant's respective arguments or respective amendments, the

previous specification objections to the abstract have been withdrawn.

14.   The use of the trademark "Siebel" <u>and several others</u> has been noted in this

application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the

generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the

proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent

their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Drawings

15.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)

because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the

description: all reference characters for Figs. 6 and 7. Corrected drawing sheets in

compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the

reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are

required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any

amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the

immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each

drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top

margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If

the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and

informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the

drawings will not be held in abeyance.

16.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4)

because numerous reference characters (taken individually) have been used to

designate different objects. For example, reference character "135" has been used to

designate both an agent (Fig. 1) and Siebel Web Client (Fig. 3). Corrected drawing

sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to

avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should

include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if

only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of

an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New

Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next

Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

17.   In light of the applicant's respective arguments or respective amendments, the

previous claim objections to the claims have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

19.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

20.   Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Patent No. 6,453,038 (McFarlane et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,901,380

(Bremers).

For **Claim 1**, McFarlane teaches: "A method of maintaining skills for agents of a

contact center, [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 11-28] the method comprising:

- providing profiles in a central skill database for a plurality of agents [McFarlane,

  col. 4, lines 7-28 with McFarlane, Fig. 6] wherein the central skill database has

  limited access to a routing system of the call center to optimize contacts;

  [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 53-59]

- receiving skill data from a skill-impacting system for a first agent; [McFarlane, col.

  11, lines 23-55]

- updating a first profile in the central skill database for the first agent based on the skill data received [McFarlane, col. 11, lines 23-55 with McFarlane, col. 12, lines 17-20]

- ...such that the routing logic determines which of the plurality of agents are to handle a contact based on at least skill data" [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 40-59]. McFarlane discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach:

- "...selectively synchronizing routing logic of the routing system with skill-based information from the first profile in the central skill database ..., wherein the synchronizing is independent of the updating."

With respect to Claim 1, an analogous art, Bremers, teaches:

- "...selectively synchronizing routing logic of the routing system with skill-based information from the first profile in the central skill database ..., wherein the synchronizing is independent of the updating" [Bremers, col. 6, lines 32-42 with Bremers, col. 8, lines 27-39 with Bremers, col. 9, lines 35-42 with Bremers, cols. 15-16, lines 63-8 with McFarlane, col. 5, lines 49-51 with McFarlane, col. 10, lines 29-47 (which is a summary/example of McFarlane, col, 7, lines 19-67)].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bremers with McFarlane because both inventions are directed towards utilizing databases on computers.

Bremers's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with McFarlane's invention because both inventions use databases. McFarlane discloses a system for integrating agent database access skills in call center agent assignment

applications comprising an agent database and routing calls to the proper agents, however McFarlane does not expressly disclose selectively synchronizing routing logic of the routing system with skill-based information from the first profile in the central skill database such that the routing logic determines which of the plurality of agents are to handle a contact based on at least skill data, wherein the synchronizing is independent of the updating. Bremers discloses a merchandising system method and program product utilizing an intermittent network connection comprising synchronizing modifications of databases where the synchronization can be on a scheduled basis.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the synchronization methods and a second database to synchronize with from Bremers and install them into the invention of McFarlane, thereby offering the obvious advantage of reducing the bandwidth on the database of agent skills so as to reduce cost.

Claim 2 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Bremers) as follows: "The method from claim 1, further comprising:

- receiving a contact from a customer; [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 28-33]

- processing routing logic in the routing system to select a second agent from the plurality of agents; [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 39-60] and

- routing the contact to the second agent; [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 39-60]

- wherein the routing logic depends on agent availability and the skill-based information in the routing system" [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 39-60].

Claim 3 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Bremers) as follows: "The

method from claim 1, wherein synchronizing the routing system is accomplished for a

plurality of profiles in the central skill database" [Bremers, col. 8, lines 32-43].

Claim 4 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Bremers) as follows: "The

method from claim 1, wherein updating the first profile is triggered when skill data is

received from the skill-impacting system" [McFarlane, col. 11, lines 26-55 with

McFarlane, col. 12, lines 17-20].

Claim 5 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Bremers) as follows: "The

method from claim 1, wherein synchronizing the routing system is automatically run

when triggered by an event" [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 28-60].

Claim 6 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Bremers) as follows: "The

method from claim 1, wherein synchronizing the routing system is automatically run at a

predetermined time interval" [Bremers, cols. 15-16, lines 63-8].

Claim 7 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Bremers) as follows: "The

method from claim 1, wherein the skill data is received from a plurality of skill-impacting

systems" [McFarlane, col. 11, lines 23-55 with McFarlane, col. 12, lines 17-20].

For **Claim 8**, McFarlane teaches:

- ...maintaining a plurality of profiles in a central skill database corresponding to a

  plurality of contact center agents, [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 7-28 with McFarlane,

  Fig. 6] wherein the plurality of profiles comprise skill-based ratings for a plurality

  of skills and wherein the central skill database has limited access to a routing

system of the call center to optimize contacts; [McFarlane, col. 11, lines 22-26

with McFarlane, Fig. 6]

- using data from at least one skill-impacting system to update the plurality of

  profiles in the central skill database; [McFarlane, col. 11, lines 23-55 with

  McFarlane, col. 12, lines 17-20]

- ...wherein the source data is based on agent skills and configures routing logic to

  make routing decisions" [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 39-60].

  McFarlane discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach: "A

method for synchronizing skill data in a contact center, comprising:

- ...maintaining source data in a routing system for the contact center

- ...selectively updating the source data based on agent skills with skill-based

  ratings in the central skill database for reconfiguring the routing logic, wherein the

  updating the source data is independent of updating the plurality of profiles."

  With respect to Claim 8, an analogous art, Bremers, teaches: "A method for

synchronizing skill data in a contact center [Bremers, col. 6, lines 32-42 with Bremers,

cols. 15-16, lines 63-8] comprising:

- ...maintaining source data in a routing system for the contact center [Bremers,

  col. 6, lines 19-42 with McFarlane, col. 4, lines 39-60]

- ...selectively updating the source data based on agent skills with skill-based

  ratings in the central skill database for reconfiguring the routing logic, wherein the

  updating the source data is independent of updating the plurality of profiles"

  [Bremers, col. 6, lines 32-42 with Bremers, cols. 15-16, lines 63-8].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bremers with McFarlane because both inventions are directed towards utilizing databases on computers.

Bremers's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with McFarlane's invention because both inventions use databases. McFarlane discloses a system for integrating agent database access skills in call center agent assignment applications comprising an agent database and routing calls to the proper agents, however McFarlane does not expressly disclose synchronizing the routing system with skill based information from the first profile in the central skill database. Bremers discloses a merchandising system method and program product utilizing an intermittent network connection comprising synchronizing databases.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the synchronization methods and a second database to synchronize with from Bremers and install them into the invention of McFarlane, thereby offering the obvious advantage of reducing the bandwidth on the database of agent skills so as to reduce cost.

Claim 9 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Bremers) as follows: "The method from claim 8, further comprising:

- identifying at least one contact characteristic for a customer; [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 28-35] and

- selecting an agent from the plurality of agents for the customer; [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 39-60]

- wherein selecting comprises processing the routing logic to consider the skill-

  based ratings of the plurality of agents in view of the at least one contact

  characteristic" [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 39-60].

Claim 10 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Bremers) as follows:

"The method from claim 9, wherein selecting further comprises choosing an agent who

is a best-fit" [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 51-60 with McFarlane, col. 5, lines 61-65 with

McFarlane, col. 8, lines 7-11].

Claim 11 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Bremers) as follows:

"The method from claim 8 wherein maintaining the plurality of profiles is triggered by the

occurrence of a skill-changing event indicated by the at least one skill-impacting

system" [McFarlane, col. 11, lines 26-55 with McFarlane, col. 12, lines 17-20].

Claims 12-18 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that

of Claims 1-7, respectfully, in addition to a system and some modules for performing the

method steps of Claims 1-7, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 12-18 are rejected for the

same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 1-7, respectfully.

Claims 19-22 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that

of Claims 8-11, respectfully, in addition to a system and some modules for performing

the method steps of Claims 8-11, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 19-22 are rejected for

the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 8-11, respectfully.

Claims 23-29 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that

of Claims 1-7, respectfully, in addition to a computer program on a computer readable

medium and some code for performing the method steps of Claims 1-7, respectfully.

Therefore, Claims 23-29 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 1-7, respectfully.

Claims 30-33 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claims 8-11, respectfully, in addition to a computer program on a computer readable medium and some code for performing the method steps of Claims 8-11, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 30-33 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 8-11, respectfully.

21.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

22.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent S. Stace whose telephone number is 571-272-8372 and fax number is 571-273-8372. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-5:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brent Stace

JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100